

Tuesday, February 16, 1965

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Wednesday, February 17, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1966 budget estimates for the Department of the Interior, and related agencies, receiving testimony in behalf of funds for his bureau from Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, who was accompanied by his associates.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee held hearings on S. 693, to amend in several regards the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, having as its witnesses Arthur H. Dean, of the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, New York City; Robert Dechert, who represented the American Bar Association; Maurice N. Quade, chairman, Coordinating Committee on Relations of Engineers in Private Practice With Government, New York City; and J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 48 public bills, H.R. 4934-4981; 30 private bills, H.R. 4982-5011; and 21 resolutions, H.J. Res. 321-326, H. Con. Res. 288-296, and H. Res. 233-238, were introduced.

Pages 2688-2691

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 2208, modifying the flood control project on the Scioto River, Ohio (H. Rept. 46);

H.R. 4606, modifying the flood control project for Four River Basins, Fla. (H. Rept. 47);

Disposition of executive papers (H. Rept. 48);

H. Res. 233, providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to increase the authorization for appropriations (H. Rept. 49); and

H. Res. 234, providing for the consideration of and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 45, to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (H. Rept. 50).

Page 2688

Legislative Program: Announcement was made that on Wednesday the House would consider H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to increase the authorization for appropriations (2 hours of

debate). On Thursday consideration will be given H.R. 45, to increase U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank (4 hours of debate).

Page 2627

Committee Investigations: The House considered and by voice votes adopted the following resolutions providing investigatory authority of matters coming within the jurisdiction of the following committees:

H. Res. 35, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce;

H. Res. 80, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

H. Res. 94, Committee on Education and Labor;

H. Res. 112, Committee on Science and Astronautics;

H. Res. 118, Committee on Armed Services;

H. Res. 133, Committee on Banking and Currency;

H. Res. 141, Committee on Public Works;

H. Res. 19, Committee on the Judiciary;

H. Res. 44, Committee on the District of Columbia;

H. Res. 68, Committee on Veterans' Affairs;

H. Res. 84, Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

H. Res. 89, Committee on Agriculture.

Pages 2627-2631, 2634-2637

Small Business Problems: Adopted H. Res. 13, to create a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business. Subsequently

D101

the Speaker announced the appointment of the following to membership on the Small Business Committee: Representatives Evins, chairman, Patman, Multer, Steed, Roosevelt, Kluczynski, Dingell, Smith of Iowa, Weltner, Moore, Smith of California, Harvey of Indiana, Conte, Broyhill of North Carolina, and Hortor. Pages 2631-2634

Acting Clerk: Heard the reading of a communication from the Clerk of the House designating John A. Roberts to act as Clerk of the House of Representatives during his temporary absence. Page 2688

Program for Wednesday: Adjourned at 1:33 p.m. until Wednesday, February 17, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will consider H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to increase the authorization for appropriations (2 hours of debate).

Committee Meetings

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT—TRAINING

Committee on Education and Labor: Held a hearing on H.R. 4257, H.R. 4270, and H.R. 4271, bills to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended. Testimony was given by public witnesses.

FOREIGN AID

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Met in executive session on foreign aid with Thomas C. Mann, U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, and William D. Rogers, Deputy Coordinator, Alliance for Progress. The committee will continue in executive session Wednesday, February 17.

COMMUNISM

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs met in executive session to continue a briefing by John H. Crimmins, Coordinator of Cuban Affairs, on communism.

COIN SHORTAGE

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs held a hearing regarding the coin shortage. Testimony was given by Representative McClory; Robert Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and public witnesses.

PRESIDENTIAL—VICE-PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Committee on the Judiciary: Continued hearings on H.J. Res. 1, and similar bills, to propose an amendment to the Constitution relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Testimony was given by Representatives Fuqua

and Mathias; Justice Michael Musmanno, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; and a public witness.

ARMS CONTROL

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule, with 2 hours of debate, on H.R. 2998, to amend and extend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

Testimony was given on the request for a rule by Representatives Morgan and Mailliard.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule, with 4 hours of debate, on H.R. 45, to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act.

Testimony was given on the request for a rule by Representatives Patman, Reuss, Brock, and Multer.

MEDICARE

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session to continue on H.R. 1, regarding hospitalization benefits, changes in the Social Security Act. The committee will continue in executive session on Wednesday, February 17.

Joint Committee Meetings

AEC AUTHORIZATIONS

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Committee continued its hearings on fiscal 1966 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission, receiving testimony from Charles L. Dunham, Director, Division of Biology and Medicine, Frank Baranowski, Director, Division of Production, Delmar Crosson, Director, Division of Military Application, John Abbadessa, Controller, and Howard C. Brown, Jr., Assistant General Manager for Administration, all of the AEC.

PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Joint Economic Committee: Committee announced that it will begin hearings on the President's Economic Report on Friday, February 19, when it will hear Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon. These hearings will also run from Monday, February 22, through Saturday, February 27.

BILL SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

New Law

(For last listing of public laws, see Digest, p. D19, January 14, 1965)

H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965 for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture. Signed February 11, 1965 (P.L. 89-2).

to North Vietnam and these same ships are being permitted to compete with our American-flag vessels in visiting and doing business in our own U.S. ports.

As introduced, by bill would ban these free world vessels from using U.S. ports if they engage in shipping to or from Communist Cuban or Vietcong ports.

I am hopeful that immediate hearings will be held on my bill by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The time has long since passed when the United States should firm up its policy on trading with the enemy and in this connection we should exert pressure on other free world countries to stop strengthening the Communists in Cuba and Vietnam.

The number of my bill is H.R. 6301.

JAY G. HAYDEN

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of the retirement of Jay G. Hayden, who for nearly 50 years has been a political writer in Washington for the Detroit News.

Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I include his last dispatch entitled "Signing Off." I think all of us who have known Jay and appreciated his outstanding services will be interested in his "last dispatch" which appeared in the Detroit News on February 26, 1965:

HAYDEN IN WASHINGTON: SIGNING OFF

(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—In this, my last dispatch, to the Detroit News after more than 49 years as a Washington correspondent it seems fitting to recall a few of the changes, particularly as affecting news reporting, over this long period.

Taking off from Detroit on Christmas Day, 1915, I boarded the Pennsylvania Railroad's Capitol Limited at 11 a.m. and arrived in Washington after breakfast the following morning.

Moving my family later, our model T Ford was loaded in a freight car along with the furniture and was 5 weeks in transit. The automobile, drained for fear of fire, was pushed out on the freight platform on arrival and treated to one quart of free gasoline to enable me to drive it away. I seem to recall that the price of gasoline at that time was about 10 cents a gallon.

There were advantages and disadvantages for newspaper reporters in those days. Helpful was the total absence of radio and television, leaving printed words all alone in the field of public information. Telephones were widely used locally, but had barely begun to develop over long distances. News transmission within the United States and overseas was almost exclusively by hand operated telegraph or by mail.

COMPETING WIRES

There was the advantage, however, that competition between two telegraph companies, Western Union and Postal, for newspaper trade was terrific. Their lines were numerous and manned in the press galleries of Congress, at the White House, and wherever else news was breaking.

The most important single difference between 1916 and the present is the phenomenal growth of Federal Government, not only in personnel, physical establishment, and ex-

penditure, but in activities affecting the lives of all American people.

The whole cost of the Federal Government for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1916, was \$734,156,202. There was great commotion when for fiscal 1917 President Woodrow Wilson asked for and was granted appropriations slightly exceeding \$1 billion. Expenditures for fiscal 1917 actually leaped to \$1,977,681,751 due to the U.S. declaration of war against Germany, April 7, 1917. The peak annual expenditure during the World War I period, for fiscal 1919, however, was only \$18,514,879,955.

The latter figure has been exceeded in every year beginning with 1943 and climaxed by \$97,670,862,844 for fiscal 1964 under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

By all present signs Federal cost escalation is still going on, and so long as deficits continue to grow it is just as certain that the burden must fall back one day on the shoulders of American taxpayers.

EASIER TO SEE

News reporting was more fun in the earlier days due to much closer contacts with ruling officials. If memory serves, no pass was required for reporter admission to the White House until World War II, but that impediment has continued since, in war or peace.

For President Wilson's 8 years the Congressional Directory lists only three White House assistants—Joseph P. Tumulty, secretary, Thomas Brahany, chief clerk, and Rudolph Forester, executive clerk—and that's actually all there were except women typists.

The comparable roll of White House aids to President Johnson published in January 1964, numbered 27 and certainly at salaries so high that they would have caused even President Wilson's Cabinet members to blush.

In Congress there is only one man left from the 1915-16 session and curiously his surname is the same as this writer. He is CARL HAYDEN, 87-year-old Senator from Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate, and chairman of its Committee on Appropriations.

Senator HAYDEN was first elected to the House in 1912, coincident with admission of his State to the Union, and continued to serve in that body until 1927 when he advanced to the Senate where he has remained ever since.

VOTING RIGHTS AND SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Congress was in the midst of much controversy over a proposed civil rights bill. After much debate during the long, hot summer, a bill finally emerged, thanks to the Members of both political parties who realized that discrimination had no place in the scope of full American life.

In that bill was a section on voting rights. I am sure the people of the Nation returned to their chores with the feeling that at long last every American would have an equal opportunity to register and vote, regardless of his race, color, or creed. Perhaps that is why the recent events in Selma, Ala., have come as a shock to the Nation, including the people of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, if the present law is so weak that it deprives any of our citizens of their treasured American right to vote,

or if the law has loopholes that prevent the Federal Government from enforcing voting rights, then the law must be changed. And it must be changed promptly. When a minority has waited so long for such a privilege, guaranteed to all Americans, he must not be forced to wait any longer. But this time, let us make sure we are giving him that right so that there is no further question on the subject and so that there is no further duress on either side.

And further, Mr. Speaker, before any of us condemn the community of Selma, we must realize that there, too, Americans live and work. All are not bitter racists, all are not club-swinging and tear-gas throwing police or troopers.

One thing seems clear. If Federal laws have been broken in Selma, Ala., no matter which side or person broke them, prompt action should be taken by the Federal Government. If no Federal laws have been violated, then we cannot demand Federal force simply because it appears to be humane. Violence cannot be condoned by any of us, but it cannot be suppressed without due cause, or by any agency other than one so authorized.

Let the Congress then proceed with diligence and determination to consider in proper course the legislation that has been recommended to us by the President.

REPEAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS

(Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, Congress voted temporary increases in excise tax rates to help cover the cost of our country's participation in the Korean war. The increases were extended in 1954 and annually since then. Taxes on general telephone service and transportation, which had been imposed in 1941, were included in the annual extensions starting in 1959. The excise tax extensions have been one of many measures designed to finance the uncontrolled spending appetite of the big central government.

I firmly believe the selective excise tax is discriminatory and should be scrapped. The Congress has a moral obligation to the people to eliminate these temporary taxes which were imposed for a special purpose so long ago. I know that previous efforts to accomplish this reform in Congress have failed. But something must be done to alleviate the burden of these unfair taxes that hit hardest at the low income citizen who must pay the same tax rates as those with a greater ability to pay. One of the most unjust excise taxes is the 10 percent levy on communications.

Altogether, the Federal Government expects to take in about \$14.7 billion from excise taxes this fiscal year. Of this amount, telephone and telegraph users will pay one billion dollars to the Federal Government for the privilege of

Approved For Release 2003/10/22 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500170021-6

using communication services. In my State of Tennessee, consumers will pay \$14½ million in communications excise tax this year. Of course, the telephone and telegraph companies pay Federal taxes too, and since some of this by necessity must be passed on to the user, the American people are suffering double taxation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would repeal the excise tax on communications, and I urge my colleagues to rally their support to this important measure.

FEDERAL OFFENSE TO ASSASSINATE THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would make it a Federal offense to assassinate the President or Vice President of the United States, or the next person in line of succession to the Presidency.

I would like to state for the record that, when the idea of such a law was first proposed immediately after the assassination of President Kennedy, I had some reservations about such a statute because it occurred to me that a basic constitutional issue was involved; namely, that of Federal impingement upon the exercise of police powers which are constitutionally reserved to the States.

After considerable thought and weighing of all the factors involved, I reached the conclusion that the killing of the President or Vice President of the United States, or the next person in line of succession—our highest Federal officers—is certainly a matter of valid and deep concern to the Congress and the people of the Nation as a whole and a matter in which the Federal Government may properly exercise even an exclusive jurisdiction.

This is not new ground. As most of you know, the Congress, operating on a similar principle, has already exercised its powers in this area in section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, which makes it a Federal offense to kill other lesser Federal officers, such as Federal judges, FBI or narcotics agents, and postal inspectors.

In addition, when we are dealing with situations which, in some instances, could have national as well as international ramifications—as I will shortly point out—it seems to me that there is a very real necessity for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, which I have the honor to chair, has looked into this problem very carefully. In its annual report for the year 1963, with my endorsement, it recommended enactment of legislation to make the killing of the President or Vice President a Federal offense. The committee has been pleased to note that the Warren Commission, in its report of September 24, 1964, came to the same conclusion as the committee had on this matter.

Since the initial recommendation in its 1963 report, the committee, continuing its study of the matter, has reviewed the various bills introduced in the Congress which would implement its recommendation. On March 8, a bill which encompassed its recommendation was submitted by the Attorney General. This bill would make it a crime, not only to kill, or attempt or conspire to kill, the President or Vice President or the next person in line of succession, but would also make it a crime to assault, or to kidnap, or attempt or conspire to kidnap, them. It is my view, based on the committee study I have referred to, that this bill would be most effective in meeting the problem before us. It is for this reason that the bill I introduce today is an identical bill, filed in support of the administration's proposal.

Careful analysis of all factors involved in this issue make it clear, I now believe, that there are a number of reasons why existing State laws may, in many cases, be inadequate vehicles for the prosecution of Presidential or Vice-Presidential assassins.

These reasons have been pinpointed in the assassination of President Kennedy and in certain other recent developments.

The Warren Commission has found that Lee Harvey Oswald shot President Kennedy. It has also found that one of the factors that may have influenced him to kill the President was "His avowed commitment to Marxism and communism."

Oswald's Communist ties and commitments are now well known and documented. He had resided in the Soviet Union for 2 years, where he attempted to renounce his U.S. citizenship and expressed his hate for the United States and his desire for its capitalist government to be overthrown. Shortly before he assassinated our late President, he made a trip to Mexico City where he contacted both the Soviet and Cuban embassies.

It is known that he was in contact with the New York headquarters of the Moscow-controlled Communist Party and also of the Socialist Workers Party, the Trotskyist Communist organization in this country. Both of these organizations have international ties. Oswald was also an activist in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, an organization having ties with the Communist government of Cuba.

A few weeks ago the New York Times published an account which stated that, within the last year, 50 local Philippine officials had been assassinated by the Hukbalahaps, the military arm of the Philippine Communist Party. In South Vietnam, too, local governmental officials have been assassinated in considerable number by Communist agents and forces during the past few years.

The possibility of international ramifications in any assassination of a President or Vice President of the United States is obvious in the context of world conditions today. The Warren Commission took note of this and probed deeply into it. President Johnson also took note of it even before his appointment of the Warren Commission, when he ordered a full-scale investigation of

President Kennedy's assassination by the Department of Justice. His order, of course, brought the total facilities of the FBI into the investigation.

We are faced with the fact that today there is a strong possibility that here, as in other countries, individual Marxists or Marxist organizations may be involved in assassination plots. This being so, tracking down the assassin or assassins and developing all the facts about the conspiracy—should an assassination be the result of such—involves authority, funds, and facilities which simply do not exist in any one of our 50 States. The assassin or his associates, for example, may have to be trailed to foreign countries—to Europe, Latin America, or some other part of the world.

No State had the facilities to make the national and international type investigation that was required for development of the facts in the Oswald case. It was necessary for the President of the United States to utilize in full the research and investigative resources of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, the State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and other governmental groups.

All these facts argue for enactment of Federal legislation in this area.

It is my hope the Congress will act in the near future to meet adequately the problem we now face. In the belief that it may help the debate which will take place, I call the attention of the House to the recommendation on this subject made by the Committee on Un-American Activities, in its 1963 annual report. The text of the recommendation follows:

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The rules of the House and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in establishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have directed the committee to make investigations of subversive propaganda activities in the United States, whether of a domestic or foreign origin, that attack the principle of the form of government guaranteed by our Constitution and to investigate all other questions in relation thereto that would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. A duty was further imposed to make a report to the House of the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Pursuant to this mandate, the committee makes the following recommendations:

I. ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

It is recommended that legislation be adopted to make punishable as a Federal offense the unlawful killing of the President or Vice President of the United States.

Title 18, United States Code, sections 1111, 1112, and 1113, respectively, make murder, manslaughter, the attempt to commit murder or manslaughter, Federal crimes only when committed within "the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States." This special jurisdiction is defined in section 7 of title 18, United States Code, and generally includes the waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States (high seas and navigable waters) and lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under its exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction.

Murder or manslaughter of the President or Vice President would also be punishable under Federal law if committed while aboard an aircraft in flight in interstate or foreign commerce (49 U.S.C. sec. 1472(k)).

Approved For Release 2003/10/22 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500170021-6

In addition, wrecking a train, or its facilities and appurtenances used in interstate or foreign commerce, resulting in the death of any person (including, of course, the President or Vice President) is a Federal offense punishable under section 1991, 18 United States Code.

Apart from these statutes, the only provision of law making murder or manslaughter committed within the jurisdiction of any State punishable as a Federal crime is section 1114 of title 18, U.S.C. This section, however, is limited to the killing of certain officers and employees of the United States, principally law enforcement officers, while engaged in the performance of official duties or on account of the performance of official duties. It applies only to categories of employees specifically listed in the section, such as: Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, marshals, and deputy marshals, employees of the FBI, Justice Department, Secret Service, Narcotics and Customs Bureaus, Internal Revenue and National Park Services; postal inspectors, immigration officers, Coast Guardsmen, and persons carrying out certain assignments for the Agriculture and Interior Departments or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The committee believes it a matter of importance to the national security that the unlawful killing of the President or Vice President be made punishable as a Federal offense, even though such act is committed within the jurisdiction of one of the States. Certainly, from the constitutional and various other viewpoints, the President and Vice President are more important personages than the Federal officers listed in section 1114, title 18, mentioned above, and their deaths have far greater impact on the national security and welfare. The reasons which support section 1114, therefore, sustain the present recommendations.

Additional reasons are suggested by the circumstances surrounding the November 22, 1963, assassination of President Kennedy by the accused, Lee Harvey Oswald, a self-confessed Marxist. They are also suggested by the overall context of the present world situation.

According to the precepts and dogma of communism, "peace-loving Socialist" (i.e. Communist) forces are waging an irreconcilable struggle against "imperialist capitalists" led by the United States. Communists are taught that they must work for the destruction of all non-Communist governments and that victory will surely be theirs because the so-called laws of history make a Communist world society absolutely inevitable.

The Congress has found:

"There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world through the medium of a worldwide Communist organization."¹

Within the United States, the world Communist movement is spearheaded by the Communist Party of the United States, a group operating under the control of the Soviet Union.² Other Communist groups of

notable strength in the United States, generally described as Marxist-Leninist or Marxist (and usually having international ties), although following independent disciplines, are dedicated to the same basic views and objectives and often operate in concert with the Communist Party.

The objective of all these groups is the overthrow of the U.S. Government with a view toward supplanting it with a Soviet-style or "proletarian" dictatorship. Together they swell the tide of activity directed toward this end. The basic doctrines of these groups teach violence, revolutionary action, and involve the adherents in an emotional atmosphere of fixed, intense hatred of non-Communist governments and those who constitute their leadership. Tons of propaganda to this effect are disseminated among them, and among non-Communists in the United States as well, by such groups and also outside it—by groups in the Soviet Union, Red China, Cuba, and numerous Communist parties and groups throughout the world.

The fact that an admitted Marxist with a variety of Communist associations and ties stands accused of assassinating the President of the United States created a deep stir and frantic reaction within the Communist movement. Leaders of Communist groups hastened to disassociate themselves from the actions of Oswald and were quick to claim that Marx and Lenin—and they themselves—rejected "such acts of violence and terror." Even today, the Soviet Union and the U.S. Communist Party persist in promoting the claim that the President was assassinated by some as yet undiscovered "rightist" or that Oswald was "an informer and provocateur for the FBI or some other intelligence agency of the U.S. Government."

The fact of the matter is that Lenin admonished all Communists: "We have never rejected terror on principle, nor can we do so."

Lenin made this statement in the course of a criticism of certain Russian revolutionaries who had supported recent attempts on the life of a czarist government official and a church dignitary and who were forecasting a reign of "Red terror." He wanted it understood, however, that his objections to assassinations were based on his opinion that they were "inopportune and inexpedient" under "present circumstances." Successful overthrow of the czarist government, Lenin stated at this time (1901), depended upon the creation of a "central revolutionary organization" to lead the discontented masses. "Departure of the most energetic revolutionaries to take up the work of terror," he said, would impede efforts to establish such an organization. He went on to say:

"Terror is a form of military operation that may be usefully applied, or may even be essential in certain moments of the battle, under certain conditions . . . We would not for one moment assert that individual strokes of heroism are of no importance at all. But it is our duty to utter a strong warning against devoting all attention to terror, against regarding it as the principal method of struggle, as so many at the present time are inclined to do."

finding was sustained by the United States Supreme Court in *Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Board*, 367 U.S. 1 (1961).

¹ Herbert Aptheker, leading U.S. Communist Party theoretician, writing in the party's monthly, *Political Affairs*, February 1964, p. 52.

² Lenin, "Where to Begin?" (May 1901), *Selected Works*, (New York: International Publishers, 1943), vol. II.

³ Ibid.

Years later, on October 25, 1916, in commenting on the assassination of the Austrian Prime Minister by the Austrian Socialist, Friedrich Adler, Lenin was much more specific in stating his view of political assassinations: "As for the political evaluation of the act, we, of course, remain in our old conviction, confirmed by the experience of a decade, that individual terroristic acts are a purposeless form of political struggle."

Lenin once again took pains, however, to show that he was not against assassinations, per se:

"Killing is no murder," wrote our old Iskra⁴ about assassinations. We are not at all against political murders . . . but from the point of view of revolutionary tactics, individual acts are purposeless and harmful. . . . Only in direct, immediate connection with a mass movement could or should individual terrorist acts be of use.

"It would have been good if there had been found some leftist group which would have published in Vienna a broadside . . . which would have justified Adler's act morally (Killing is no murder), but which would have explained to the workers that it is not terrorism that is needed but a systematic, continuous, self-sacrificing work of revolutionary propaganda, agitation, etc. . . ."

What is the real Communist view of assassinations?

"Killing is no murder . . . We are not at all against political murders."

What really mattered to Lenin—and matters to Communists today? The "political evaluation of the act." That is what counts—the Communist evaluation of whether or not the assassination is useful to their cause.

When Lenin wrote "Where To Begin?" he was mainly concerned with the lack of a "central revolutionary organization" (i.e. Communist Party) to exploit unrest in Russia which had been manifested in recent student demonstrations. Under the prevailing circumstances, he considered individual acts of terror diversionary, "inopportune and inexpedient." But he clearly implied that under different conditions they would be important "individual strokes of heroism."

Moreover, since Lenin's time, the Communists have made it clear that their "political evaluation of the act" is such that they do not limit Lenin's principle (the utility of assassinations) to the conditions prescribed in a general way in "Where to Begin?"

Was the assassination of President Kennedy an expedient, useful act from the Communist viewpoint? We can hardly expect to learn the answer to this question from the only persons in positions to really know the truth, the leaders of the principal Communist camps. What we have seen, conflicts: professed regret in Moscow, open jubilation in Peiping.

Whether the assassination of President Kennedy was an individual act or the work of a conspiracy (the committee takes no position on this question), it is clear that Communist adherents, in whom ideas of violence, disloyalty, and hatred are daily inculcated by the propaganda organs of the Communist movement and the statements of its leaders, cannot be expected always to understand or act upon the refinements of Communist dogma or directives or judgments as to the expediency of a particular act at any given moment. Because hate is so large an element

⁴ Lenin, letter to Franz Koritschoner, Sochineniya (Works) (3d ed.: Moscow: Partinoe Izdatelstvo (Party Publishing House)), vol. XXIX (1933), pp. 311-313.

⁵ A newspaper which was established by Lenin and his friends in Germany in 1900 and illegally distributed within Russia.

⁶ Lenin, letter to Franz Koritschoner, op. cit.

¹ Internal Security Act of 1950, sec. 2(1).

² After receiving voluminous evidence, the Subversive Activities Control Board pronounced the Communist Party of the United States to be a disciplined organization operating in this Nation under Soviet Union control with the objective of installing a Soviet-style dictatorship in the United States. This

March 16, 1965

In Communist doctrine and propaganda, it is reasonable to conclude that Oswald's close association with the Communist movement and reading of its propaganda organs markedly influenced his conduct. Oswald was involved in the U.S. Communist agitation-propaganda effort, leading the attempted organization of a Fair Play for Cuba Committee Chapter in Dallas—and the Communist propaganda he read portrayed the President as the leader of that Government deemed by Communists to be their principal enemy.

On Sept. 9, 1963, just a few months before the assassination of President Kennedy, the Miami Herald published the following dispatch from Havana, Cuba, which, in the light of subsequent events, assumes great significance, particularly in view of Oswald's role in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee:

HAVANA.—Prime Minister Fidel Castro said Sunday U.S. leaders would be in danger if they helped in any attempt to do away with leaders of Cuba.

"Bitterly denouncing what he called recent U.S. promoted raids on Cuban territory, Castro said:

"We are prepared to fight them and answer in kind. U.S. leaders should think that if they are aiding terrorist plans to eliminate Cuban leaders, they themselves will not be safe."

"The bitterest Castro attack yet on President Kennedy was made early Sunday morning in a rambling, informal postmidnight dissertation following a reception at the Brazilian Embassy.

"Kennedy is the Batista of his times . . . and the most opportunistic American President of all times," Castro said.

Fulgencio Batista was the Cuban dictator ousted by Castro's revolution.

"The United States, Castro said, 'is fighting a battle against us they cannot win.'

"Kennedy is a cretin," Castro asserted, 'and a member of an oligarchic family that controls several important posts in the Government. For instance, one brother is a Senator and another, Attorney General . . . and there are no more Kennedy officials because there are no more brothers.'

"Castro also disclosed that Cuba has not yet made up its mind about signing the limited nuclear test ban treaty drawn up last month in Moscow.

"A recent dispatch from Moscow indicated the Russians themselves have been puzzled by Cuba's silence in connection with the treaty. Speculation there was that Castro was holding out for more Soviet economic aid and threatening to cast his lot with the Red Chinese.

"The Prime Minister did not explain which points in the treaty were being given most consideration. But he said:

"We are taking into account the current world situation, which of course involves the Caribbean situation, which has been deteriorating in the last few days due to piratical attacks by the United States against the Cuban people."

"He accused the United States of carrying out 'double-crossing and shifting policies.' He added:

"The United States is always ready to negotiate and make promises which later it will not honor. This has happened to promises made during the October crisis. They have been broken as can be seen with new attacks. But I warn this is leading to a very dangerous situation that could lead to a worse crisis than October's."

"Castro said recent sea and air raids on Cuban industry had done no damage to speak of, and said Cubans knew 'the hand of the United States and its Latin American puppet governments, particularly Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua, are behind those attacks.'

In the recommendations for amendment of the 18, United States Code, to give Federal jurisdiction in the offenses set forth, the committee finally observes that, where acts of violence involve Marxist movements, all facts can be developed only with the assistance or use of Federal agencies. These movements are largely national and international in scope and frequently involve foreign governments, groups, or organizations. State officers do not have the facilities or means to develop all facts surrounding the commission of an offense in which such individuals are involved. The direction by President Johnson to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (rather than to the Dallas Police Department or the Texas Department of Public Safety) and the creation of a special national commission to ascertain the facts surrounding the assassination of President Kennedy would seem to make this clear. Moreover, bringing the commission of the offense within the jurisdiction of the United States also avoids a conflict of investigative jurisdiction, places responsibility in the Federal authorities, and thus avoids any deterioration of the investigative process. For all these reasons the committee recommends legislative action.

Mr. LONG of Maryland (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTING METHODS

Mr. ULLMAN (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in my speech of last Wednesday, I brought to

He said he was not worried by economic problems or any other problems, although "there is a certain disorganization which we are correcting."

Another incident which demonstrates Castro's view on the utilization of terror should be kept in mind.

In November 1962, less than a month after the Cuban missile crisis, the FBI arrested five pro-Castro Cubans in New York City. Two of them were attached to the Cuban mission to the United Nations. Another had recently arrived in the United States on a diplomatic passport to serve with the mission, but had not yet been granted official diplomatic accreditation.

The five had weapons, explosives, and incendiary devices in their possession at the time of their arrest. According to the FBI, they intended using the weapons to damage oil refineries in New Jersey and also to create panic by exploding them in large retail stores in New York City. They were formally charged with conspiring to injure and destroy national defense materials.

Following a formal protest from the Department of State, the two so-called diplomats left the United States and returned to Cuba. The other three were not tried, but were exchanged in April 1963 for Americans held by Castro.

Inasmuch as three of these Cubans were official representatives of the Castro regime in the United Nations, there can be little doubt but that their conspiracy to sabotage—and to utilize terror devices that would probably have killed a number of people—had Castro's blessing.

the attention of this body the fact that the Bonneville Power Administration, which has been authorized by Congress to market the hydroelectric power produced at Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest, is ahead in its repayment obligation to the U.S. Treasury. This fact bears repeating because of the possibility for misunderstanding about the recent audit report of the General Accounting Office, which is critical of the system-wide accounting procedures adopted by the BPA in its 1963 financial report. It is a gross misrepresentation for anyone to generalize the objections of the Comptroller General in such a fashion as to leave doubts about the record of the Bonneville Power Administration in discharging the responsibilities imposed by Congress.

Regretfully, such generalizations have been made, and it is my purpose to set the record straight. Those who oppose such beneficial power and resource programs on ideological grounds should inquire more fully into the financial record of BPA before they attack the system on grounds of its financial feasibility.

It is not my purpose here to judge which agency is correct in its accounting requirements. That is a matter for determination by the Secretary of Interior and the Comptroller General, and discussions have been underway to iron out points of difference. In its 1964 financial report, the Bonneville Power Administration reverted to its previous practice of reporting both on the basis of GAO requirements and by its own standards. In comparing the results of the two methods for 1964, it is important to note that the operating statement and balance sheet are more favorable when GAO procedures are used. I hope this lays to rest the accusation that the Bonneville Power Administration is using accounting procedures that show it in the most favorable light, and last Wednesday I cited figures to clearly demonstrate this fact.

The obligation of the Bonneville Power Administration to pay back the Federal investment in Northwest power facilities is clear in law, and it is to this obligation that the Administrator must direct his financial policies. Congress has started that repayment must be made within a "reasonable" period, and it has been determined, in practice, that this means 50 years for power generating projects and the service life of transmission lines, the latter presently being treated as 40 years for lines with steel towers. Even the General Accounting Office has recommended that the stringent requirements for dams be liberalized. But I will not go into that point today—suffice it to say that the accounting methods of BPA are based upon the paramount requirement for repayment of principal and interest, as well as all operating and maintenance costs, to the U.S. Treasury.

The General Accounting Office, on the other hand, recommends that a depreciation schedule be set up over the "service life" of the projects. Let us reflect a moment on the dilemma this poses for the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration. Congress has indicated a requirement to repay each project